| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |
|---|---|--|
|   | 09/782,874  | WASSENEGGER ET AL.   |
|   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |
|   | David T. Fox  | 1638   |
| All Participants:   | Status of Application: <u>070</u>                               |  |
| (1) <u>David T. Fox</u> .   | (3)   |  |
| (2) <u>Kathleen D. Rigaut</u> .   | (4)   |  |
| Date of Interview: 12 January 2006  | Time:   |  |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:  | nt's representative)  |  |
| Part I.   | •   |  |
| Rejection(s) discussed: proposed double patenting rejection of claim 29 over claim 11 of p  | parent patent 6,218,142   |  |
| Claims discussed: claims 29 and 65-70   |   |  |
| Prior art documents discussed:  |   |  |
| Part II.  |   |  |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER Exmr proposed examiner's amendment to overcome double pater   |   |  |
| Part III.   |   |  |
| <ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul> | examiner will provide a writte<br>ecord of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
| Deut P  |   |  |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/  | Applicant's Representative Sig                                  | gnature – if appropriate)                                  |